WEST VALLEY COLLEGE
PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes - Approved
Tuesday, September 18, 2012 Meeting
Fox 106
2:30 – 4:00 PM

I. Call to Order & Roll Call

Committee Chairman, John Hannigan called the meeting to order at 2:30.

Hannigan, John, Faculty, Program Review Chair and Comm. Studies Chair	P	Hanton, Tanya, Classified, Sr. Administrative Asst. and Program Review Recorder	P
Bond, Inge, Administrator, Director of Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness	P	Henderson, Jim, Faculty, Business	P
Davis, Heidi, Faculty, PE	P	Kashima, Stephanie, Administrator, Dean of Instruction and Student Success	P
Flynn, Paula, Classified, Language Arts SOC	P	McGinley, LeAnn, Faculty, Assessment Coordinator	P

II. Order of the Agenda

No changes to the agenda.

III. Approve Minutes

Due to the absence of a recording secretary for the past several months, the meeting notes were not reviewed at this time.

IV. Comments from Guests

No comments from guests.

V. Collaborative Summary Review – program self-evaluations

Committee Chair John Hannigan demonstrated how to use Drop Box, the software that allows users to share documents online. Once the Drop Box program is loaded onto a computer, the user can drag and drop (or Save As) documents to be shared. Before the files are uploaded (or reloaded) into Drop Box, they need to be saved using a naming convention. John will put the formula for naming files in Drop Box.

The group broke into two groups to discuss the program review submissions each committee member had reviewed. Specifically, the discussion focused on the criteria used to

determine if a program review is inadequate and to confirm with peers that this rating is appropriate for each submission to be returned with an inadequate label. Another common reason for returning an inadequate review is if a question left blank.

Both groups concluded that a program review would be inadequate if goals were set in the prior year's review and not discussed in the current program review. The review should state whether or not the goals have been met, and if not, what steps have been taken to reach the goal in the last year and what steps are planned for this year. Or, if there was a reason steps could not be taken at this time, it should be stated.

The groups also noted that there may be more "inadequate" notations and fewer "exemplary" ones since the reviewers weren't given the rubric criteria before preparing their reviews. Presumably, this will change beginning with the next year's program review submissions.

The group also brainstormed ideas for a letter to accompany program reviews returned to the departments. One idea was to include checkboxes, so the reason for the return can be easily be identified.

VI. Review Success & Retention Data

The question was raised as to what to do about programs whose data has greatly improved or declined since the last data was made available. A decision was made to use the data that existed at the time the review was prepared, even if something happened subsequently to change the data, including errors or new rules.

VII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00.

Minutes prepared by Tanya Hanton.